

AMENDMENTS TO THE ABSTRACT

The abstract is being substantially rewritten. Therefore a new abstract in clean text (no markings) is submitted on a separate sheet according to 37 C.F.R. § 1.72. Please cancel the previous abstract.

Attachment: New Abstract

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the preceding amendments and following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-6 are amended. Claim 1 is the sole independent claim. Applicants note that the term "unit" in the original claims was improperly translated, and should have been properly translated into the term "set." The currently amended claims reflect the proper translation ("set").

Applicants further appreciate the Examiner's indication that the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed on December 17, 2004 has been considered.

Objection to the Specification

The Specification is objected to regarding format. Applicants have amended the Specification to include the headings which were suggested by the Examiner.

Objection to the Abstract

The Abstract is objected to for informalities. A new abstract is provided that is clear and concise, and satisfies MPEP § 608.01(f). Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the Abstract be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as not being described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey possession of the claimed invention, regarding the terms "second and third conditions," "foreseen diffusion," and "foreseen diffusion parameters" in claim 1.

Applicants have deleted these terms from claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that the specification reasonably conveys possession of the claimed invention. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection of the claims be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite with respect to the terms "during the planning preparation...", "conditions of digital content," "conditions of diffuser," "conditions defined by the supplier," and "conditions with the foreseen diffusion."

Applicants have deleted or substantially amended the above terms. For example, the term “conditions defined by the supplier” has been amended to recite, “conditions defined by a supplier of the digital content including operational conditions and structural conditions.”

Therefore, Applicants submit that the claimed invention is more definitely claimed, and Applicants respectfully request that this rejection of the claims be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Tantawy et al. (US Patent No. 6,597,891). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons detailed below.

Independent claim 1 recites, in part:

preparing a broadcast of the at least one digital content by
establishing:

a structural configuration of the broadcast by **introducing characteristics of different equipments intended for broadcasting in order to set the first set of data**, and
operational conditions of the broadcast by introducing at least the time and date of the broadcast in order to set the second set of data,

For instance, an example, non-limiting embodiment discloses a method for validating broadcast conditions of digital content that is carried out in a management center without the interaction of an end-user. The first set of data (previously wrongly translated as “unit”) may be the data provided with the author or supplier of the digital content. As such, the method may divide the data into technical characteristics (e.g., low or high definition, satellite or IP broadcast, which network is concerned, one or more languages of the broadcast, etc.) and operational conditions (e.g., the time and date, optionally with or without advertisement, etc.).

Therefore, by such configuration, the method may process automatically the verification of all the parameters so that all conditions set forth by the supplier are respected.

The Office Action, at pages 9 and 10, asserts that all of the features of claim 1 are disclosed by Tantawy. Applicants respectfully disagree.

For example, Tantawy, at lines 48-55 of column 6, merely states:

. . . In step 406, the Broadcast Control Center 6 schedules the transmission of the requested content, and sends the scheduled time to the Content Host Emulator 2 together with tuning information and assembly information at the scheduled time for download, the Content Host Emulator 2 communicates the tuning info to the End User Device 109, which uses it to tune to the correct digital channel and to filter the requested Digital Content . . .

Thus, Applicants submit that Tantawy does not teach or suggest **“introducing characteristics of different equipments intended for broadcasting in order to set the first set of data,”** as required by claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Tantawy.

Applicants submit that claims 2-6, dependent on independent claim 1, are patentable for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1 as well as for their own merits.

The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of each of the pending claims in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.


Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. §1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By



John A. Castellano, Reg. No. 35,094

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

JAC/DJC/EGO/dmc

EGV